

## SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Subsequent to the telephone Interview held on 5-11-2010 with the Applicant's representative L. Alan Collins, Reg. No. 57,646, and in compliance with the requirements of MPEP §713.04 and 37 CFR §1.133(b), Applicants hereby submit a Substance of Interview.

The Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed amendments to **claim 1** as presented herein in view of cited art. In particular, the "defining a query related character patter" was discussed in that characters entered by a user are compared to the pattern and, when a match occurs, the system performs the substantially simultaneous updating. It was also discussed that the pattern does not include an "explicit indicator of submission of the query" but does include five particular pattern elements as recited. Also discussed was the "substantially simultaneously" providing of an updated query results list and an updated list of query refinement options, a feature not suggested by the cited art. Finally, it was also discussed that an icon from the recited plurality of type icons is displayed adjacent to each refinement option in the updated list of query refinement options where both the recited plurality of type icons and the icons displayed adjacent to each refinement option in the list are features not suggested by the cited art. Agreement was reached that the amendments to **claim 1** as provided herein appear to overcome rejections based on the cited art, pending any additional search and further consideration by the Examiner.

Amendment Responsive to 2-24-2010 Office Action  
Application Number: 10/749,936  
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3–5, 10–14, 16, 20, 21, 24, 25, and 41–46 are pending. Claims 1, 3–5, 10–14, 16, 20, 21, 24, and 25 are amended. Claims 6, 15, 17, 23, and 27–40 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2, 7–9, 18, 19, 22, and 26 were previously canceled. Claims 41–46 are new. Claims 1, 13, 21, 25, and 41 are independent.

**1. Support for Claim Amendments and New Claims**

1.1. Support for the claim amendments and new claims can be found in the original specification at least on page 4, lines 1–3; page 5, lines 9–11; page 6, lines 19–20; page 8, lines 1–12 and 26–31; page 9, lines 7–9 and 18–21; page 10, lines 8–18; page 11, lines 9–14 and 26–27; page 12, lines 1–8; page 14, lines 14–19; and in FIGs. 2 & 3 . Therefore, the amendments do not constitute new matter.

**2. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 12, 38, and 39**

2.1. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 12, 38, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega (US 6,564,213) and Gross (US 2004/0143564) and Anick (US 6,947,930) and Mishelevich (US 6,434,547). Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

2.2. Regarding independent claims 1, the Examiner alleges that Ortega teaches “providing the user with one or more suggested query replacement options each time a

Amendment Responsive to 2–24–2010 Office Action  
Application Number: 10/749,936  
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01

defined query related character pattern is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission” (OA, pg. 3, lines 6–8). Further, the Examiner alleges that Gross teaches “providing the user with an updated query result each time a defined query related character is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission”, while admitting that Ortega fails to disclose such (OA, pg. 3, lines 16–18). But **claim 1** encompasses *substantially simultaneously providing both an updated query result list and a list of query refinement options*. So while Ortega may suggest query refinement options, and while Gross may suggest an updated query result list, Ortega and Gross considered separately and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “substantially simultaneously providing the user, in response to the detecting, with both an updated query result list and a list of one or more query refinement options”, as recited in **claim 1**. Further, neither Anick nor Mishelevich cure the deficiencies of Ortega and Gross. Accordingly, Ortega, Gross, Anick, and Mishelevich, considered separately and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in **claim 1**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

2.3. Further regarding **claim 1**, the Examiner alleges that Ortega teaches “defining one or more query related character patterns that do not include an explicit indicator of query submission” and, for support, suggests that a user typing in characters discloses this feature (OA, pg. 2, lines 18–20). But Applicants respectfully traverse at least because *a user entering characters* fails to suggest *defining a character pattern*, as encompassed by **claim 1**. In summary, **claim 1** encompasses defining a pattern and then comparing characters entered by a user to the pattern. When the user-entered characters match the pattern, then the user is provided “substantially simultaneously” with both an updated query results list and an updated list of query refinement options.

2.3.1. Regarding the pattern, **claim 1** recites “defining a query related character pattern”:

2.3.2. “that *does not* include the explicit indicator of submission of the query”,

2.3.3. “but that *does* include”:

2.3.4. “a series of characters followed by a space character”,

2.3.5. “one or more characters followed by a predefined time delay”,

2.3.6. “one or more characters followed by a deleted character”,

2.3.7. “a predefined number of characters”, and

2.3.8. “predefined words”.

2.3.9. Thus the “query related character pattern” recited in **claim 1** *does not include* an “explicit indicator of submission of the query” *but does include all five recited pattern elements*.

2.3.10. Regarding the user-entered characters, **Claim 1** encompasses *detecting user entry of characters that match the recited pattern*. Ortega, on the other hand, teaches autocompletion strings, but fails to suggest *detecting characters that match a pattern* such as the “query related character pattern” recited in **claim 1**. Further, neither Gross, Anick nor Mishelevich cure the deficiencies of Ortega. Accordingly, Ortega, Gross, Anick, and Mishelevich, considered separately and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “defining a query related character pattern that does not include the explicit indicator of submission of the query but that does include: a series of characters followed by a space character, one or more characters followed by a predefined time delay, one or more characters followed by a deleted character, a predefined number of characters, and predefined words”, as recited in **claim 1**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

2.4. Further regarding **claim 1**, the claim encompasses *each query refinement option displayed with an adjacent icon from a plurality of icons that includes a spell correct icon and a narrowing icon and a broadening icon and a synonym icon*. The Examiner alleges that Liu (2003/0225756) teaches a broadening icon and, for support, cites Liu, FIG. 2, “Broader Term checkbox” in dialog box 150, while admitting that Ortega, Gross, Anick, and Mishelevich fail to suggest such (OA, pg. 27, last line–pg. 28, line 7). But Liu actually teaches that the “Broader Term” *checkbox is part of a search pane* (para 0030) rather than suggesting *an icon displayed adjacent to a query refinement option in a list of such options*, as encompassed by **claim 1**. In particular, Liu’s *checkbox* is not *an icon displayed adjacent to a query refinement option*, as encompassed by **claim 1**. Further, Liu fails to disclose or suggest “a plurality of type icons including a spell correct icon and a narrowing icon and a broadening icon and a synonym icon”, as recited in **claim 1**. Nor does the other cited art suggest such. Accordingly, Ortega, Gross, Anick, Mishelevich, and Liu, considered separately and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “wherein each of the one or more query refinement options in the list is displayed with an adjacent type icon from a plurality of type icons including a spell correct icon and a narrowing icon and a broadening icon and a synonym icon, wherein the spell correct icon indicates that an adjacent query refinement option is a spelling correction, and wherein the narrowing icon indicates that an adjacent query refinement option narrows the query, and wherein the broadening icon indicates that an adjacent query refinement option broadens the query, and wherein the synonym icon indicates that an adjacent query refinement option includes a synonym”, as recited in **claim 1**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

2.5. Regarding **claims 3, 6, 10, 12, 38, and 39**, **claims 6, 38, and 39** are canceled while **claims 3, 10, and 12** depend from allowable **claim 1** and are therefore likewise allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**3. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claims 13–17 and 20**

3.1. The Examiner has rejected **claims 13–17 and 20** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Mishelevich. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

3.2. Regarding independent **claim 13**, the Examiner rejects this claim for essentially the same reasons as **claim 1**. In particular, the Examiner alleges that Ortega teaches providing query refinement options as a user enters characters (OA, pg. 7, lines 4–12), and that Gross teaches providing updated query results based on user input without a query submission (OA, pg. 8, lines 1–14). But **claim 13** encompasses *simultaneously providing both an updated query result list and a list of query refinement options*. Therefore, **claim 13** is allowable for at least the same reasons discussed with respect to **claim 1** herein above. Accordingly, Ortega, Gross, and Mishelevich, considered separately and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “simultaneously providing the user, in response to the detecting, with both an updated query result list and a list of one or more query refinement options”, as recited in **claim 13**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

3.3. Regarding **claims 14–17 and 20**, **claims 15 and 17** are canceled while **claims 14, 16, and 20** depend from allowable **claim 13** and are therefore likewise allowable for at

least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**4. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claim 40**

4.1. The Examiner has rejected **claim 40** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Mishelevich and Anick. **Claim 40** is canceled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**5. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claims 5, 21, 23–25, and 27**

5.1. The Examiner has rejected **claims 5, 21, 23–25, and 27** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Anick and Mishelevich and Van Vleet (US 2006/0112178). Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

5.2. Regarding **claim 5**, Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that Van Vleet fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ortega, Gross, Anick, and Mishelevich with respect to **claim 1**, from which **claim 5** depends. Accordingly, **claim 5** is allowable over Ortega, Gross, Anick, Mishelevich, and Van Vleet for at least the same reasons discussed herein above with respect to **claim 1**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

5.3. Regarding independent **claim 21**, the Examiner rejects this claim for essentially the same reasons as **claim 1**. In particular, But **claim 21** encompasses *simultaneously providing both an updated query result list and a list of query refinement options*. Therefore, **claim 21** is allowable for at least the same reasons discussed with respect to

Amendment Responsive to 2–24–2010 Office Action  
Application Number: 10/749,936  
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01

**claim 1** herein above. Further, Van Vleet fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ortega, Gross, Anick, and Mishelevich with respect to **claims 1 and 21**. Accordingly, Ortega, Gross, Mishelevich, and Van Vleet, considered separately and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “simultaneously providing the user, in response to the detecting, with both a query result list and a list of one or more query refinement options”, as recited in **claim 21**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**5.4.** Regarding independent **claim 25**, the Examiner rejects this claim for essentially the same reasons as **claim 1**. In particular, But **claim 25** encompasses *simultaneously providing both an updated query result list and a list of query refinement options*. Therefore, **claim 25** is allowable for at least the same reasons discussed with respect to **claim 1** herein above. Further, Van Vleet fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ortega, Gross, Anick, and Mishelevich with respect to **claims 1 and 25**. Accordingly, Ortega, Gross, Mishelevich, and Van Vleet, considered separately and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “a display configured to simultaneously present to the user, in response to the received query defining characters, both a query result list and a list of query refinement options”, as recited in **claim 25**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**5.5.** Regarding **claims 23, 24, and 27**, **claims 23 and 27** are canceled while **claim 24** depends from allowable **claim 23** and are therefore likewise allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.



**6. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claim 4**

6.1. The Examiner has rejected **claim 4** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Anick and Mishelevich and Bowman (US 6,006,225). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that Bowman fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ortega, Gross, Anick, and Mishelevich with respect to **claim 1**, from which **claim 4** depends. Accordingly, **claim 4** is allowable over Ortega, Gross, Anick, Mishelevich, and Bowman for at least the same reasons discussed herein above with respect to **claim 1**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**7. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claim 16**

7.1. The Examiner has rejected **claim 16** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Mishelevich and Bowman. Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that Bowman fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ortega, Gross, and Mishelevich with respect to **claim 13**, from which **claim 16** depends. Accordingly, **claim 16** is allowable over Ortega, Gross, Mishelevich, and Bowman for at least the same reasons discussed herein above with respect to **claim 13**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**8. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claim 29**

8.1. The Examiner has rejected **claim 29** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Mishelevich and Van Vleet and Chan (2006/0129915). **Claim 29** is canceled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**9. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claim 28**

9.1. The Examiner has rejected **claim 28** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Anick and Mishelevich and Van Vleet and DeMello (6,714,214). **Claim 28** is canceled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**10. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claims 11 and 30–32**

10.1. The Examiner has rejected **claims 11 and 30–32** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Anick and Mishelevich and Valk (2003/0182463). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that Valk fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ortega, Gross, Anick, and Mishelevich with respect to **claim 1**, from which **claim 11** depends. Accordingly, **claim 1** is allowable over Ortega, Gross, Anick, Mishelevich, and Valk for at least the same reasons discussed herein above with respect to **claim 1**. Further, **claims 30–32** are canceled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Amendment Responsive to 2–24–2010 Office Action  
Application Number: 10/749,936  
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01

**11. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claims 33 and 34**

11.1. The Examiner has rejected **claims 33 and 34** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Anick and Mishelevich and Liu (2003/0225756). **Claims 33 and 34** are canceled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**12. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claims 35 and 36**

12.1. The Examiner has rejected **claims 35 and 36** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Anick and Mishelevich and Van Vleet and Liu. **Claims 35 and 36** are canceled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**13. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claim 37**

13.1. The Examiner has rejected **claim 37** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Anick and Mishelevich and Valk and Liu. **Claim 37** is canceled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Amendment Responsive to 2-24-2010 Office Action  
Application Number: 10/749,936  
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above Amendments and Remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over any cited art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this Amendment, that the Application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Responsive to 2-24-2010 Office Action  
Application Number: 10/749,936  
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01

**AMENDMENT**

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,  
Microsoft Corporation

Date: 5-14-2010

By: /L. Alan Collins/

L. Alan Collins, Reg. No.: 57,646  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond WA 98052-6399  
Telephone: (425) 707-9382

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**  
**(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

5-24-2010  
Date

/L. Alan Collins/  
L. Alan Collins

Amendment Responsive to 2-24-2010 Office Action  
Application Number: 10/749,936  
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01